FOIA Resource

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 8:53 PM
To: FOIA Resource
Subject: FOIA Request

FOIA/PA REQUEST
Case No.: 2010-0186
Date Rec'd: 3-30-10
Specialist: Christian
Related Case:

Good day,

This is a request under FOIA. The SL-1 reactor was destroyed on January 3rd, 1961 with 3 fatalities. I am studying various aspects of the event. In doing so, I request the following:
Request Part 1: Section 5 of IDO-19302, "IDO Report on the Nuclear Incident at the SL-1 Reactor on January 3, 1961 at the National Reactor Testing Station" describes the efforts to recover the 3 victims. Page 101 contains the statement "Material previously printed on this page has been deleted from this report -"

The report was categorized as "Reactor Technology "under the 16th edition of TID-4500 and was prepared by:
The SL-1 Report Task Force
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Idaho Operations Office
Idaho Falls, Idaho
Please provide the deleted information on page 101 or any available reason as to why it was deleted.

Request 2: I request a copy of "SL-1 Reactor Accident Autopsy Procedures and Results, LAMS-2550"; it is not available at NTIS or the LANL site. This document is referenced on page III-101 of IDO-19311 "Final Report of SL-1 Recovery Operation". The following additional information is on the title page of IDO-19311:
SL-1 Project
Idaho Test Station
General Electric Company
July 27, 1962
United States Atomic Energy Commission
Contract No. AT (10-1) 1095

The autopsy report might also be filed under "LA-2550-MS".

I do not believe either of these requests to fall under the medical information exclusion of FOIA. The manner in which two of the victims died is in the public domain as well as some information on their contamination levels and dose rates. The purpose of my requests is to understand the body positionings at the time of the accident as well as the distribution of contamination and difficulty of removal. I do not intend to use the information to discern motivation for any of the actions taken by the 3 victims.

A general comment is that the quality of scanned information varies widely; ORNL typically is very good but Los Alamos is somewhat illegible at times. May I ask that extra care be taken in making the reproductions?
Regards,
Barry Quigley
[redacted]